

Appendix C. Coordination with Other Planning Efforts

Introduction

Provisions of the 1982 Planning Rule state that the responsible line officer shall review the planning and land use policies of other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and American Indian tribes. This review should include consideration of objectives as expressed in their plans and policies, an assessment of interrelated impacts of these plans, a determination of how each forest plan deals with the impacts, and where conflicts arise, consideration of alternatives for resolution of conflicts.

In addition, Forest Service Chief Tom Tidwell has called for an “all lands approach” to management. This involves landowners, governments, and agencies working together across boundaries to determine common goals for the landscapes they share.

This document is written in response to the direction in 1982 Planning Rule Provisions as well as to help determine and display strategies for accomplishing national forest management using an all lands approach. It summarizes objectives and policies of various levels of government and tribal groups related to Prescott National Forest (Prescott NF) resource management, displays how the Prescott NF proposed revised plan is expected to respond to these objectives and policies, and makes a determination of whether there are conflicts that need to be addressed in alternative comparison in the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS). The document is organized as follows:

- Objectives/concerns of **local government** plans (including towns, cities, and regional plans)
- Objectives/concerns of **county governments** as expressed in their plans and policies
- Objectives/concerns of **State agencies**
- Objectives/concerns of other **Federal agencies**
- Objectives/concerns of **tribal governments**

Local Government Plans

Table 1 summarizes natural resource related objectives or concerns of local governments, such as towns, cities, or regions; provides questions related to those concerns that the Prescott NF proposed revised plan needs to answer; responds to the questions based on the proposed revised plan; and displays whether a conflict exists and needs to be considered in an alternative in the DEIS. Community and town general plans that exist within or near the Prescott NF were included. The Verde Valley Regional Plan was also included.

Table 1. Objectives or concerns from local government plans and how the Prescott NF proposed revised plan responds

Objectives or Concerns	Questions the Proposed Revised Plan Needs to Answer	Proposed Revised Plan Response	Need for Alternative?
Ash Fork USDA Forest Service Action Plan II, 2004			
There were concerns about littering and trash dumping on national forests. Forest Service kiosks, maps, and information are desired at the Ash Fork Visitor Center.	How can the Prescott NF work with Ash Fork to help avoid dumping and improve clean-up efforts? Can Prescott NF information be provided to people or tourists in Ash Fork?	Appendix B, Proposed and Probable Management Practices, includes exploration of partnership opportunities to collect and dispose of dumped material. Recreation desired conditions include strategically locating facilities to respond to changing demographics and demand. Obj-14 calls for developing additional methods for providing visitor information.	NO
Paulden Community Plan, 2007			
Paulden vision statement emphasizes retaining a sense of openness for the area. Goal 1 lists prevention of breaking up rural areas as key to sustaining a rural character. Goal 6 includes providing for wise use of scarce water resources. Trails within Paulden are recommended and there would likely be a desire to connect with national forest trails at public/private boundaries.	How can the Prescott NF assist in providing open space and rural character to the Paulden area? How can the Prescott NF assist in providing for wise use of water resources? How can the Prescott NF coordinate with trail recommendations within Paulden?	Needs for change for the revision of the Prescott NF 1987 plan include: (1) enhancing the scenic value of Prescott NF provided open space; (2) maintaining or improving watershed integrity to provide desired water quality, quantity, and timing of delivery; and (3) providing diverse recreational experiences that reflect desires of local communities. Desired condition descriptions were developed for open space, watershed, and recreation. Obj-7, Obj-11, and Obj-17 call for addition of recreation areas, trailheads, improving trails. Obj-18 and Obj-20 call for improvement of watershed conditions and trails/roads that may be impacting watershed condition. Obj-29 calls for acquiring lands as feasible and available to improve open space character and enhance riparian habitat across the Prescott NF.	NO Alternative D does include an objective that calls for construction of new trails.
Town of Chino Valley 2003 General Plan, 2003			
Policy RObj-4.3 expresses desires to link the town's recreation resources to other recreation resources surrounding the community. Goal EP-4 promotes contiguous open areas for wildlife habitat and	How can the Prescott NF provide links to Chino Valley's recreation resources? How can the Prescott NF cooperate with Chino Valley in providing open areas for wildlife habitats?	The Prescott NF does not share a boundary with the town of Chino Valley. However, desired condition statement, objective, and guideline (DC-Rec-1, Obj-14, and Guide-Rec-3) direct the Prescott NF to look for new ways to share information related to recreational opportunities on the national forest. Obj-27 calls for treatment of areas to enhance pronghorn	NO Alternative C provides for increased amounts of habitat and migration

Objectives or Concerns	Questions the Proposed Revised Plan Needs to Answer	Proposed Revised Plan Response	Need for Alternative?
protection of sensitive natural terrain.		migration as well as treatment of habitat to improve pronghorn habitat quality.	habitat improvement for pronghorn.
Prescott Basin Community Protection and Economic Development Plan, 2004			
<p>The goal of the plan is to convince home and property owners within the wildland-urban interface of the necessity and responsibility to adopt defensible space and other techniques to develop a defensible boundary around the urban interface.</p> <p>In addition, the plan calls for increased commercial use of material removed during fuel reduction activities.</p>	How can the Prescott NF cooperate in both commercial and noncommercial fuel reduction activities?	<p>Needs for change for the proposed revised plan include restoring vegetation arrangements, plant species, and fire to selected ecosystems.</p> <p>Desired conditions at the mid-scale level for vegetation types surrounding the Prescott Basin include descriptions of younger, widely spaced vegetation within the wildland-urban interface. DC-Veg-2 also calls for sustainable amounts of products to be produced.</p> <p>Objective ranges allow for increased mechanical or prescribed fire treatments in ponderosa pine, grasslands, piñon-juniper, and chaparral.</p>	NO Objectives in alternative C provide for increased treatment in ponderosa pine and grasslands, with less treatment in chaparral and piñon juniper types.
Yavapai Communities Wildfire Protection Plan, 2004			
This plan was developed as an ongoing collaborative process to reduce the risk of wildfire within combustible vegetation that surrounds communities within the planning area boundaries, including: Prescott, Cherry, Spring Valley, Crown King, Yarnell, Skull Valley, and others.	How can the Prescott NF collaborate with communities, fire suppression organizations, and the Prescott Area Wildland-Urban Interface Commission in decreasing fuels and reducing risks of catastrophic wildfire?	<p>Management approaches indicate that the Prescott NF will continue to be a part of volunteer efforts to manage natural resources; this would include the Prescott Area Wildland-Urban Interface Commission.</p> <p>Desired conditions were developed for vegetation types that departed from estimated historical ranges, and objectives calling for more frequent disturbance as prescribed fire or mechanical fuel removal are included. Desired conditions at the mid-scale level for vegetation types found within wildland-urban interface include descriptions for more widely spaced vegetation and a shorter interval between disturbances.</p>	NO

Objectives or Concerns	Questions the Proposed Revised Plan Needs to Answer	Proposed Revised Plan Response	Need for Alternative?
Prescott General Plan, 2003			
Strategies and goals that relate to the Prescott NF include: (a) expand cooperative programs including trail connectivity and maintenance standards; (b) confer with Prescott NF and others to protect viewsheds, wildlife habitat, cultural resources, and riparian areas; and to integrate systems involving open space and recreation; (c) cooperate with others in preventing aquifer contamination; (d) link public and private open space and trail systems; and (e) retain current government functions.	<p>How can the Prescott NF cooperate with the city of Prescott in protecting viewsheds, wildlife habitat, cultural resources, riparian areas, and aquifers?</p> <p>How can the Prescott NF provide connectivity in trail systems and open space areas?</p> <p>Will the Prescott NF continue its current functions?</p>	<p>Desired conditions for scenery (DC-Scenic-1, DC-Open Space-1), wildlife habitat (DC-Wildlife-1, DC-Aquatic 1 and 2), cultural resources (DC-Heritage-1), and watershed health (DC-Watershed-1 to 6) have been included.</p> <p>Objectives set priority for achievement of projects to retain and improve watershed health. Terrestrial and aquatic wildlife habitat and scenic value are also included.</p> <p>Standards and guidelines that provide guidance for carrying out projects have been developed to maintain and improve scenic values (Guides-Scenic-1 to 9, Guide-Wildland Fire-6), wildlife habitat (Guides-Fish/Aquatics-1 to 4, Guides-WL-1 to 8), cultural resources (Guides Heritage-1 and 2), and watershed health (Stds-WS-1 to 3, Guides-WS-1 to 11, Guide-Trans-6, Guide-Rec-6, and Guide-Wildland Fire-8).</p>	NO
Prescott Valley General Plan 2020, Adopted in 2002			
<p>Prescott Valley goals or policies that may interact with the Prescott NF include the following:</p> <p>EPW-A6—Promote environmental awareness and resource conservation.</p> <p>EPW-A9—Provide contiguous open areas for wildlife habitat and protection of sensitive natural terrain.</p> <p>EPW-A9.1—Support preservation of contiguous open space for migration of native wildlife.</p> <p>EPW-A9.3—Actively participate with appropriate Federal, State, and county agencies that are trying to preserve or aid endangered</p>	<p>How does the Prescott NF proposed revised plan blend with Prescott Valley's desire to promote environmental awareness?</p> <p>How does the Prescott NF proposed revised plan address contiguous open areas for wildlife habitat and endangered or threatened wildlife?</p> <p>How can the Prescott NF coordinate with Prescott Valley to preserve archaeological, paleontological, and historic resources?</p>	<p>A desired condition statement, objective, and guideline (DC-Rec-1, Obj-14, and Guide-Rec-3) guides the Prescott NF to look for new ways to share information related to recreational opportunities on the national forest.</p> <p>Desired conditions are described for desired wildlife habitat (DC-Wildlife-1, DC-Aquatic 1 and 2). Objectives set priority for achievement of projects to retain and improve terrestrial and aquatic wildlife habitat. Obj-1, Obj-3, Obj-25, and Obj-26 provide for improving migration and other habitat for pronghorn on the national forest.</p> <p>Guide-WL-1 to 8 provide guidance for protecting wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Guide-WL-1 and Guide-Fish/Aquatics-1 provide direction for threatened and endangered species.</p> <p>DC-Heritage-1 includes guidance to provide opportunities for interpretation, research, stewardship, and enjoyment of our cultural past.</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>Alternative C provides for increased amounts of habitat and migration corridor improvement for pronghorn. It also provides for increased acreage of prescribed burning in semi-desert grasslands to</p>

Objectives or Concerns	Questions the Proposed Revised Plan Needs to Answer	Proposed Revised Plan Response	Need for Alternative?
wildlife. EPW-A10.2—Coordinate with appropriate agencies to protect and preserve the town’s archaeological, paleontological, and historic resources.		Appendix B, Proposed and Probable Management Practices, includes reference to volunteer assistance in managing resources. Heritage resources are a part of this.	restore ecosystem character and improve habitat.
Town of Dewey-Humboldt 2009 General Plan			
<p>Dewey-Humboldt goals/objectives include the following:</p> <p>Open space/Trails Goal 1—Coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions and agencies to achieve regional open space goals.</p> <p>Open space/Trails Goal 2—Protect scenic vistas, wildlife corridors and habitats, major washes, and riverbeds. This includes limiting development potential on sensitive lands such as locations where threatened, endangered, or desirable indigenous species may be found.</p> <p>Open space/Trails Goal 3—Encourage accessibility to outdoor enjoyment by residents and visitors.</p> <p>Environmental Planning Goal 1—Highlight community sustainability by preserving the quality of air, water, and scenic resources.</p> <p>Environmental Planning Goal 3—Extend positive environmental influences beyond the town’s boundaries, including soliciting</p>	<p>How might the Prescott NF help to achieve regional open space goals?</p> <p>What is the Prescott NF including in the proposed revised plan related to scenic vistas and view protection cooperation?</p> <p>How might the Prescott NF plan relate to wildlife corridors and habitats, or locations where threatened or endangered species may be found?</p> <p>Does the Prescott NF proposed revised plan include components that will assist in encouraging accessibility to outdoor enjoyment?</p> <p>How might the Prescott NF proposed revised plan help preserve air and water quality and scenic resources?</p> <p>In what way will watercourse characteristics be monitored?</p>	<p>Open space was a major need for change in developing the proposed revised plan. DC-Open Space-1 states that there is a desire to retain open space values such as naturally appearing landscapes, wildlife habitat, recreation opportunity, and riparian/wetland character. Obj-29 calls for obtaining lands where feasible and available to retain open space values and protect and enhance riparian habitat.</p> <p>Desired conditions for scenery (DC-Scenic-1, DC-Open Space-1) have been included. Standards and guidelines that provide guidance for carrying out projects have been developed to maintain and improve scenic values (Guides-Scenic-1 to 9, Guide-Wildland Fire-6). Guide-Lands-2 calls for consideration of visual characteristics when responding to land exchange proposals.</p> <p>Desired conditions for wildlife habitat (DC-Wildlife-1, DC-Aquatic 1) include statements such as, “habitats are free of negative impacts from nonnative species.” Objectives set priority for achievement of projects to retain and improve terrestrial and aquatic wildlife habitat. Vegetation types that are departed from historic conditions include treatment objectives to assist in the trend toward desired conditions. Obj-1, Obj-2, Obj-3, Obj-25, Obj-26 and Obj-27 provide for improving migration and other habitat for pronghorn on the national forest.</p> <p>Recreation desired conditions (DC-Rec-1 and 2) include statements such as: the number and location of recreation facilities respond to changing demographics and demand, and trail routes include both point-to-point trails that connect</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>Alternative C includes a higher amount of habitat and migration corridor improvement for pronghorn.</p>

Objectives or Concerns	Questions the Proposed Revised Plan Needs to Answer	Proposed Revised Plan Response	Need for Alternative?
<p>view protection cooperation from the county and land management agencies.</p> <p>Water Resources Goal 4—Protect and sustain the Agua Fria River’s viability. Monitor water quality and maintain riparian habitat along the river and other watercourses.</p>		<p>communities and interconnected loops of varying lengths.</p> <p>DC-Lands-1 includes desires for rights-of-way for which legal access is obtained.</p> <p>Objectives call for adding new developed recreation areas (Obj-7 and Obj-11) and improving the condition of existing trails (Obj-17).</p> <p>Desired conditions for watershed health (DC-Watershed-1 to 6) and airshed protection (DC-Airshed-1) have been included. Objectives (Obj-18, Obj-19, Obj-23) call for improving high priority watersheds and at risk riparian areas. Others focus on actions to decrease sedimentation (Obj-20 to Obj-22). Guidelines to protect watershed health (Guides-WS-1 to 11, Stds-WS-1 to 3, Guide-Trans-6, Guide-Rec-6, Guide-Wildland Fire-8) are also included.</p> <p>Monitoring questions include: Are management actions: (1) maintaining or making progress toward desired habitat conditions for native fish, amphibian, and reptile species?; (2) being implemented to improve watershed conditions?; and (3) reducing negative impacts to watershed conditions?</p>	
Town of Dewey-Humboldt Open Space and Trails Plan, June 2010			
<p>The town is interested in continuing its participation in the sustainable recreation strategy efforts especially related to coordination on trails and connection to regional trail systems.</p> <p>The proposed Mingus View Trail Park, Chaparral Trail Park, Henderson Regional Trail Connector, and Prescott Dells Ranch Road/Rocky Hill Road Regional Connector, would require cooperation with the Prescott NF for trail connections to trails 9419,</p>	<p>While trail construction projects will be addressed at the site-specific level, does the Prescott NF proposed revised plan allow for cooperation and coordination with the town of Dewey-Humboldt?</p> <p>Is there any guidance related to trail construction or connections?</p>	<p>Appendix B, Proposed and Probable Management Practices, recognize that: (1) citizens would like to be actively involved in national forest management and (2) volunteer assistance in trail improvement or trail construction would be part of the intent of the Prescott NF.</p> <p>The ongoing recreation strategy effort that is occurring parallel to plan revision will continue. In chapter 5 of the proposed revised plan, there are desired condition statements for geographic areas that are based on zones identified for the recreation strategy effort. Geographic areas are subdivided into management areas.</p> <p>Dewey-Humboldt occurs within the Williamson Valley South Management Area; management area desired conditions include a mixture of opportunities to affiliate with other</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>The proposed revised plan does not include objectives for constructing new trails. Therefore, alternative D was developed to provide more emphasis on dispersed</p>

Objectives or Concerns	Questions the Proposed Revised Plan Needs to Answer	Proposed Revised Plan Response	Need for Alternative?
9419A, 9405, and 43. The town may be interested in partnership opportunities for trail connectors.		groups with opportunities to be isolated from people. Obj-11 and Obj-16 call for improvement in trailheads and trails throughout the Prescott NF. Guide-Rec-6 calls for use of management tools such as information availability on the Internet, physical structures, or others to ensure resource damage due to recreation activities is prevented. Guide-Rec-10 calls for tools such as self-closing gates or gates around cattle guards for horseback riders to minimize conflicts between recreation use and livestock grazing.	recreation and calls for increased trailhead improvement and 10 to 20 miles of new trail construction.
Central Yavapai Metropolitan Planning Organization Regional Transportation Study, 2007			
The study provides alternatives and a proposal for a regional transportation system for the planning area with Yavapai County. The system has little direct impact on the Prescott NF except indirectly due to the possible increased numbers of visitors to the area. The proposed regional system (figure 5) indicates that an Eastern Corridor Study may be done sometime in the future for a controlled access facility that could overlap with the Prescott NF.	If the Eastern Corridor Study is done, will it impact the eligibility of the upper Verde River for wild and scenic designation? Could the same study interact with an identified potential wilderness area?	DC-Wild and Scenic-1 includes desires for the outstandingly remarkable values (i.e., archaeological, scenic, fishery, wildlife, recreational, and botanical) and recommended classifications to remain intact in the portion of the Verde River that is eligible for wild and scenic designation until further study is conducted or there is a designation by Congress. Std-W&S-2 states that authorized uses shall not be allowed to adversely affect either eligibility or tentative classification of eligible segments. Current classification of possible affected segments is scenic (segment 1) and wild (Segment 2). DC-Wilderness-1 includes desires for wilderness characteristics of each recommended wilderness to remain intact until further action is initiated by the Forest Service to forward recommended wilderness areas to Congress for designation. Characteristics include: scenic beauty, natural conditions, solitude, and identified special features. No recommended wilderness is expected to be affected in the proposed revised plan; however, alternative D includes the Muldoon area as recommended wilderness which could be impacted.	NO, not at this time. When the future Eastern Corridor Study begins, information sharing between Prescott NF and CYMPO will be needed to prevent possible conflicts.

Objectives or Concerns	Questions the Proposed Revised Plan Needs to Answer	Proposed Revised Plan Response	Need for Alternative?
Camp Verde General Plan, 2004			
Goals/objectives that could relate to the Prescott NF include: (1) preserve and enhance the historic character of Camp Verde; (2) develop cooperative programs to document and preserve cultural practices that reflect the history of Camp Verde; (3) encourage use of energy efficient designs and alternative building materials; (4) coordinate with agencies to enforce illegal dumping laws; (5) maintain high level of air and water quality; (6) work with the USFS to ensure land crucial to preserve important viewsheds, sensitive historic areas, and wildlife corridors are identified and protected; and (7) protect existing wildland character of national forest lands.	<p>How would the Prescott NF help enhance the historic character and cultural practices that reflect the history of Camp Verde?</p> <p>Does plan guidance call for use of energy efficient and alternative building materials?</p> <p>How does the Prescott NF expect to coordinate the enforcement of illegal dumping laws?</p> <p>What plan guidance assists with maintaining water and air quality?</p> <p>What plan guidance will help to preserve viewsheds, historic areas, and wildlife corridors?</p> <p>How does maintaining wildland character blend with plan guidance?</p>	<p>DC-Heritage-1 includes guidance to provide opportunities for interpretation, research, stewardship, and enjoyment of our cultural past.</p> <p>DC-Rec-1 expresses desire to retain characteristics of trails or facilities that qualify them for national designations (e.g., the General Crook Trail).</p> <p>DC-Transportation and Facilities-1 includes a statement indicating that facilities are energy efficient and incorporate emerging technologies.</p> <p>Appendix B, Proposed and Probable Management Practices, suggests that collaborative methods are well suited to dealing with trash dumping. Ongoing law enforcement coordination is part of normal implementation activity.</p> <p>Desired conditions for watershed health (DC-Watershed-1 to 6) and airshed protection (DC-Airshed-1) have been included. Obj-18, Obj-19, and Obj-23 call for improving high priority watersheds and at risk riparian areas. Other objectives focus on actions to decrease sedimentation (Obj-20 to Obj-22). Standards and guidelines to protect watershed health (Stds-WS-1 to 3, Guides-WS-1 to 12, Guide-Trans-6, Guide-Rec-6, and Guide-Wildland Fire-8) are also included.</p> <p>Desired conditions for scenery (DC-Scenic-1, DC-Open Space-1) have been included. Standards and guidelines that provide guidance for carrying out projects have been developed to maintain and improve scenic values (Guides-Scenic-1 to 9, Guide-Wildland Fire-6). Guide-Lands-2 calls for consideration of visual characteristics when responding to land exchange proposals.</p> <p>Guide-Heritage-1 and 2 include direction for protection of cultural sites.</p> <p>Desired conditions for wildlife habitat (DC-Wildlife-1, DC-Aquatic 1 and 2) include statements such as, "habitats are free of negative impacts from nonnative species." Objectives</p>	NO

Objectives or Concerns	Questions the Proposed Revised Plan Needs to Answer	Proposed Revised Plan Response	Need for Alternative?
		<p>set priority for achievement of projects to retain and improve terrestrial and aquatic wildlife habitat. Vegetation types that are departed from historic conditions include treatment objectives to assist in the trend toward desired conditions. Obj-1, Obj-2, Obj-3, Obj-25, Obj-26, and Obj-27 provide for improving migration and other habitat for pronghorn on the national forest.</p> <p>Guide-Lands-3 suggests that lands that have lost their wildland character may be candidates for offer in exchange. Obj-29 calls for acquiring lands as feasible and available to improve open space character and enhance riparian habitat. Guideline MA-VV-3 calls for retaining or adding to certain lands in national forest ownership in the Verde Valley between Cottonwood and Camp Verde.</p>	
Clarkdale General Plan Program 2002			
<p>About 1,850 acres of Prescott NF land was annexed to the city in 2001. It is zoned as national forest land, and there is a desire to retain it in a wild character, although trash dumping and unauthorized trails are a problem.</p> <p>Objectives that could relate to the Prescott NF are 4-A.b, 6-A.a, 6-A.b, and 6-A.c. They include: (1) protecting natural areas such as flood plains, the Verde Corridor, steep slopes, and scenic view areas; (2) maintaining high standards of air quality; (3) ensuring high water quality; and (4) supporting preservation of natural resources in Clarkdale.</p>	<p>How might the Prescott NF enhance the wildland character of lands within city limits?</p> <p>What plan components relate to protection of natural areas, scenic views, air quality, and water quality,</p>	<p>Appendix B, Proposed and Probable Management Practices, suggests that collaborative methods are well suited to dealing with trash dumping and other social challenges. Continuing work on the recreation strategy effort that is taking place parallel to plan revision may be a good platform for the determining methods for resolution of the problem.</p> <p>Desired conditions for watershed health (DC-watershed-1 to 6) and airshed protection (DC-Airshed-1) have been included. Obj-18, Obj-19, and Obj-23 call for improving high priority watersheds and at risk riparian areas. Other objectives focus on actions to decrease sedimentation (Obj-20 to Obj-22). Guidelines to protect watershed health (Guides-WS-1 to 12, Stds-WS-1 to 3, Guide-Trans-6, Guide-Rec-6, Guide-Wildland Fire-8) are also included.</p> <p>Desired conditions for scenery (DC-Scenic-1, DC-Open Space-1) have been included. Standards and guidelines that provide guidance for carrying out projects have been developed to maintain and improve scenic values (Guides-Scenic-1 to 9, Guide-Wildland Fire-6). Guide-Lands-2 calls for consideration of visual characteristics when responding to land exchange proposals. Guide-Lands-3 suggests that lands</p>	NO

Objectives or Concerns	Questions the Proposed Revised Plan Needs to Answer	Proposed Revised Plan Response	Need for Alternative?
		that have lost their wildland character may be candidates for offer in exchange. Obj-29 calls for acquiring lands as feasible and available to improve open space character and enhance riparian habitat.	
Cottonwood General Plan 2003 - 2013			
<p>A major focus of the Cottonwood Plan is to maintain open space for recreation and visual appearance, and for creating separation between Verde Valley communities.</p> <p>Areas of interest include Planning Area 12, Verde River floodway, a linkage between the Mingus Mountains and the Verde River along Black Canyon, and an area near Hayfield draw. Retaining wildland character is important in these areas.</p> <p>Air and water quality is important as well as protection of soils, mountain views, and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Specific statements include Open Space 1.2.G-H, 2.2.B, EP-1.2, 1.3, 1.5, and 1.6, and WR 1.2, and 1.3.</p>	<p>What plan components relate to retaining scenic values, mountain views, and open land—especially in Planning Area 12?</p> <p>What plan components support protection and enhancement of air, water, soil, and wildlife habitat?</p>	<p>Open space is one of the five areas identified in the proposed revised plan as priority needs for change.</p> <p>DC-Open-Space-1 indicates desires to retain naturally appearing landscapes, wildlife habitat, recreational opportunity, and riparian/wetland character. DC-Lands-2 includes statements identifying need to retain visual character, habitat, and free-flowing water within the Verde River. DC-Scenic-1 includes a desire to retain native vegetation and a high degree of scenic integrity.</p> <p>Obj-29 states that up to 10 opportunities to acquire lands as presented and as feasible will be acted upon along the Verde River, within the Verde Valley, and in other portions of the Prescott NF.</p> <p>Verde Valley Management Area desired conditions describe lands within the Prescott NF as enhancing open space, scenic, watershed, and other natural resource values; they are generally retained in national forest ownership or are obtained through land adjustment. Verde Valley Management Area guideline MA-VV-3 includes guidance to retain or obtain lands in the Verde Valley between Cottonwood and Camp Verde, which includes parts of Cottonwood Planning Area 12, for open space, wildlife habitat, or to improve watershed integrity. Guideline MA-VV-4 provides for maintaining wilderness character within the Black Canyon recommended wilderness area. MA-VV-5 provides guidance to emphasize scenic integrity within the Grief Hill Inventoried Roadless Area.</p> <p>Desired conditions for scenery (DC-Scenic-1, DC-Open Space-1) have been included. Standards and guidelines that provide guidance for carrying out projects have been</p>	NO

Objectives or Concerns	Questions the Proposed Revised Plan Needs to Answer	Proposed Revised Plan Response	Need for Alternative?
		<p>developed to maintain and improve scenic values (Guides-Scenic-1 to 9, Guide-Wildland Fire-6). Guide-Lands-2 calls for consideration of visual characteristics when responding to land exchange proposals.</p> <p>Desired conditions for watershed health and soils (DC-watershed-1 to 6) and airshed protection (DC-Airshed-1) are important. Obj-18, Obj-19, and Obj-23 call for improving high priority watersheds and at risk riparian areas. Other objectives focus on actions to decrease sedimentation (Obj-20 to Obj-22). Guidelines to protect watershed health (Guides-WS-1 to 12, Stds-WS-1 to 3, Guide-Trans-6, Guide-Rec-6, Guide-Wildland Fire-8) are also included. Soils guidelines (Guide-Soils-1 and 2) call for minimizing short and long-term impacts of soils and water resources.</p>	
Verde Valley Regional Land Use Plan, 2006			
<p>Protect backdrops of foothills and mountains to protect rural character.</p> <p>Prevent “wall to wall” land use—retain gaps between communities while retaining transportation/transit linkages.</p> <p>A clearly defined, connected trail system including multipurpose paths and on-road facilities, is desired.</p> <p>Plan for an interconnected greenway.</p> <p>The area should not be used as a source of parcels for land exchanges elsewhere in national forests within the State.</p>	<p>What plan components relate to retaining scenic values, mountain views, and open land?</p> <p>What plan components relate to trail system development?</p> <p>How do plan components assist with developing interconnected greenways?</p> <p>What are criteria for land adjustment?</p>	<p>Open space is one of the five areas identified in the proposed revised plan as priority needs for change.</p> <p>DC-Open-Space-1 indicates desires to retain naturally appearing landscapes, wildlife habitat, recreational opportunity, and riparian/wetland character. DC-Lands-2 includes statements identifying need to retain visual character, habitat, and free-flowing water within the Verde River. DC-Scenic-1 indicates a desire to retain native vegetation and a high degree of scenic integrity.</p> <p>Obj-29 states that up to 10 opportunities to acquire lands as presented and as feasible will be acted upon along the Verde River, within the Verde Valley, and in other portions of the Prescott NF.</p> <p>Verde Valley Management Area desired conditions describe lands within the Prescott NF that enhance open space, scenic, watershed, and other natural resource values. These areas are retained in national forest ownership or are obtained through land adjustment. Verde Valley Management Area guidelines include guidance to retain or obtain lands within the Verde Valley between Cottonwood and Camp Verde, including</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>Alternative D includes an objective to construct new trails, in addition to improving condition of existing trails.</p>

Objectives or Concerns	Questions the Proposed Revised Plan Needs to Answer	Proposed Revised Plan Response	Need for Alternative?
		<p>parts of Cottonwood Planning Area 12, for open space, wildlife habitat, or to improve watershed integrity. Guideline MA-VV-4 provides for maintaining wilderness character within the Black Canyon recommended wilderness area. Finally, MA-VV-5 provides guidance to emphasize scenic integrity within the Grief Hill Inventoried Roadless Area.</p> <p>While the Prescott NF is facilitating an ongoing recreation strategy and prioritization process, the proposed revised plan includes desired conditions (DC-Rec-2) that describe the character of trails on the national forest. This includes a variety of settings, point-to-point connectors, loop trails, and meeting needs of a growing population. Obj-9, O-11, and Obj-17 call for improving existing trail conditions, improving and constructing trailheads, and increasing trail maintenance.</p> <p>Obj-29, as described above, is expected to lead to land acquisition along riparian and in desired open space areas and could enhance greenways.</p> <p>Land adjustment criteria is found in Guide-Lands-2 and 3. They include consideration of wildlife habitat, wetlands, and community vision statements as exchange proposals are considered. Lands that have lost their wildland character are included as having potential for exchange.</p>	

County Governments

The majority of the Prescott NF is located within Yavapai County; approximately 2 percent of the 1.25 million acres of the Prescott NF is located within Coconino County. Approximately 38 percent of the 5.2 million acres in Yavapai County consists of national forest land ownership that is shared between the Prescott, Coconino, Kaibab, and Tonto National Forests. The Prescott NF proposed revised plan included five focus areas during revision: (1) restore the structure, composition, and function of at risk ecosystems such as grasslands, ponderosa pine, and juniper grasslands; (2) maintain and improve watershed integrity; (3) provide sustainable, diverse recreation experiences; (4) provide desired habitat for native fish; and (5) enhance scenic value of open space.

Yavapai County

Table 2 displays goals from the 2003 Yavapai County General Plan and the 2012 Draft Comprehensive Plan related to the Prescott NF and a summary of how the Prescott NF proposed revised plan addresses or blends with those goals. No conflicts between the Yavapai County Plan goals and the components of the proposed revised plan have been discovered.

Table 2. Yavapai County goals and how the Prescott NF proposed revised plan responds

Yavapai County Goals Related to the Prescott NF as Expressed in their Plans and Policies	How the Prescott NF Proposed Revised Plan Responds
Sustain the County's Rural Character	Public lands such as the Prescott NF offer rural and primitive experiences. Guide-Rec-2, DC-Transportation/Facilities-1 and individual management area desired conditions help to sustain rural character.
Maintain a Variety of Land Uses and the County's Attractive Image Maintain open space between communities, including coordinating with land agencies sale/exchange proposals to recognize existing zoning and recreational opportunities. Identify sites of scenic interest; practice visual conservation. Increase public access to water resources.	Land use and open space desired conditions, objectives, and guidelines have been developed to enhance open space especially near and between communities where feasible: DC-Open Space-1, DC-Lands-1, DC-Wilderness-1; Obj-29; Guides-Lands-2 to 7, Guides-Scenic 1 to 9, and Guide-VV-MA-3. Recreation access to the upper Verde River is expected: Obj-7.
Coordinate Transportation Planning with Agencies and Stakeholders Coordinate new road construction with other transportation and land use agencies to mitigate negative impacts to wildlife and wildlife movement corridors.	A safe, sustainable, and economic transportation system (roads and trails) that balances desire for public access with potential for ecological impacts is desired across the forest: DC-Trans/Facilities-1. Guides-Trans-3 and 5 state that roads and trails should be designed to not impede terrestrial and aquatic wildlife species movement and habitat connectivity; and that wildlife friendly design for cattle guards should be used for new installations. The Prescott NF expects to coordinate with the Arizona Game and Fish Department in development of wildlife linkages within the Prescott NF.
Preserve the Verde River and the County's Major Waterways	Watershed desired conditions, objectives, and guidelines that improve watershed, wetland, and riparian health are included: DC-WS-1 to 6, Obj-18 to 23, and Guides-WS-1

Yavapai County Goals Related to the Prescott NF as Expressed in their Plans and Policies	How the Prescott NF Proposed Revised Plan Responds
<p>Identify water supplies for a growing county. Promote conservation and reuse of water for residential, agricultural, and industrial uses. Encourage the protection of riparian areas, watercourses, and associated flood plains.</p>	<p>to 11.</p> <p>Desired conditions, objectives, and guidelines for aquatic related wildlife provide guidance for the Verde River and other waterways: DC-Aquatic-1, Obj-24, and Guides-Fish/Aquatics 1 to 4.</p>
<p>Enhance Parks and Recreational Opportunities</p> <p>Strive to reserve desirable public lands for recreation, open space, protection of wildlife habitats, and buffering residential areas. Encourage connectivity of existing trails between communities and in new developments.</p>	<p>Recreation desired conditions, objectives, and guidelines provide guidance for recreation actions: DC-Rec-1 and 2, DC-Wild and Scenic-1, DC-Wilderness-1; Obj-7 to Obj-17; Guide-Rec-1 to 12, and Std-W&S-1 to 2.</p>
<p>Preserve Open Space Character</p> <p>Protect scenic views and mountain vistas; adapt sensitively to natural areas; protect wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Retain agricultural uses, encouraging continued use of ranches, farms, and vineyards.</p> <p>Encourage property owners to maintain and protect historic access to public lands through their property.</p>	<p>Within the county, Prescott NF lands provide scenic views; wildlife habitats; recreational opportunities; and natural, undeveloped spaces. Permitting processes allow for grazing on Federal lands.</p> <p>Desired conditions are described for open space, landownership adjustment, and scenic values: DC-Open Space-1 and 2; DC-Lands-1; and DC-Scenic-1. Pronghorn antelope habitat objectives and guidelines are provided: Obj-25, Obj-27, and Obj-28. Guides-WL-3 and 8 address protection of animal movement corridors.</p> <p>Guide-Lands-1 provides direction for right-of-way authorizations and public access to forest land.</p>
<p>Identify Policies/Practices for Greater Use of Renewable Energy</p> <p>Identify areas that could be conducive to large scale renewable energy production.</p> <p>Encourage the creation of criteria in order to minimize potential issues/impacts from large-scale facilities (e.g. noise, visual aesthetics, preservation of wildlife movement corridors).</p>	<p>Direction for management of new energy sources includes an emphasis on locating power lines and pipelines within existing energy corridors when compatible: DC-Lands-1. Additional guidance is included in Guide-Lands-5 addressing visual impacts, bat and avian collisions, and other wildlife habitat concerns.</p> <p>Desired conditions for new Forest Service facilities emphasize energy efficiency and incorporating emerging technologies: DC-Trans/Facilities-1.</p>
<p>Encourage Balance between Natural and Built Environments</p> <p>Coordinate with land management agencies to create standards to protect wildland-urban interface areas.</p>	<p>Desired conditions for vegetation and fuels are provided for wildland-urban interface (WUI) areas to reduce wildfire behavior and hazards to life and property: DC-Veg-8, 10, 12, 15, and 19.</p> <p>Guide-Wildland Fire-5 and 9 provide direction for reducing fuels within wildland-urban interface areas.</p>

Coconino County

Land under management by the Forest Service makes up 28 percent of Coconino County with most within the Coconino and Kaibab National Forests. The Prescott National Forest contributes only 2,500 acres to Coconino County. Table 3 compares goals from the 2003 Coconino County Comprehensive Plan to summaries of how the Prescott NF proposed revised plan addresses or blends with those goals. No conflicts between the Coconino County Plan goals and Prescott NF revised plan components have been discovered.

Table 3. Coconino County goals and how the Prescott NF proposed revised plan responds

Coconino County Goals Related to the Prescott NF as Expressed in their Plans and Policies	How the Prescott NF Proposed Revised Plan Responds
<p>Improve forest health and promote the restoration of forest ecosystems.</p> <p>Residents of neighborhoods in wildland-urban interface areas are encouraged to participate in forest planning, management, and restoration efforts.</p>	<p>Desired conditions and objectives, describe ecosystem characteristics for plant species, vegetation arrangements, and fire frequency. Separate desired conditions for wildland-urban interface areas allow for fuel reduction activities: DC-Veg-1 to 22 and Obj-1 to 6.</p>
<p>Manage recreational uses in a manner that minimizes impacts to communities and the environment.</p> <p>The county supports private land managers, management agencies, and citizen groups in their efforts to coordinate planning and maintenance of recreational opportunities that minimize adverse impacts to natural systems and residential areas.</p> <p>The county supports and will assist other agencies with the planning and development of designated OHV routes and educational information that addresses the needs and impacts of OHV uses.</p>	<p>Plan components stress providing diverse recreational opportunities that reflect desires of local communities, avoid overcrowding and user conflicts, and minimize resource damage: DC-Rec-1 and 2, DC-Wild and Scenic-1, DC-Wilderness-1.</p> <p>Standards and guidelines related to motorized travel on the Prescott NF indicate that the motor vehicle use map is the basis for OHV or other motorized vehicle routes: Std-Rec-1 and 2, Guide Rec-1.</p> <p>Guidelines indicate that educational information will be developed and shared: Guide-Rec-3 and Guide-Interp-1.</p>
<p>Concentrate development in designated growth areas while preserving open space and landscapes.</p> <p>The county supports Federal acquisition through exchange or purchase of private inholdings surrounded by national forest or BLM lands that are important habitat areas, that contain environmentally sensitive lands, or that would reduce fragmentation.</p>	<p>Desired conditions describe desires for open space and guidelines provide criteria for land exchange or acquisition: DC-Open Space-1, DC-Lands-2, and Guide-Lands-2 and 3.</p>

State of Arizona

Goals or concerns of eight State of Arizona agencies or departments are discussed here and compared to components of the Prescott NF proposed revised plan. A summary is provided of the mission or goals of each State organization and how the proposed revised plan or its alternatives respond to those goals.

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ)

The mission of the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality is to protect and enhance public health, welfare, and the environment in Arizona. ADEQ serves as the State's environmental regulatory agency in the areas of air and water quality and waste programs. Forest management activities strive to be in compliance with the applicable Arizona Revised Statutes, particularly Title 49 which outlines specifics such as water quality standards and total maximum daily loads.

Maintaining or improving watershed integrity is one of five focus areas for plan revision. It includes providing desired water quality in rivers, streams, seeps, and springs on the Prescott NF. Desired conditions, objectives, and standards and guidelines provide direction for improving or maintaining water quality, especially those related to sedimentation: DC-WS-1 to 6, Obj-18 to 23, Guides-WS-1 to 12, Stds-WS-1 to 3, Guide-Trans-6, Guide-Rec-6, and Guide-Wildland Fire-8.

Maintaining air quality is also addressed in the proposed revised plan. DC-Airshed-1 describes conditions to which the Prescott NF aspires.

Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR)

The mission of the Arizona Department of Water Resources is to secure long term dependable water supplies for Arizona. ADWR administers and enforces the State's groundwater code and surface water rights laws. Title 45 of the Arizona Revised Statutes contains the provisions related to water and groundwater resources.

The focus area of maintaining or improving watershed integrity also includes providing desired water quantity and timing of delivery. The main influence that the Prescott NF can have on water yield is retention or restoration of desired overstory vegetation, vegetative ground cover, and disturbance regimes to provide for historic levels of water infiltration and runoff. Desired conditions for vegetation species, vegetation structural characteristics, and fire frequency are included in the proposed revised: DC-Veg-1 to 22. Desired conditions for ecosystem resilience to climate change are also included: DC-Ecosystem Resilience-1.

Arizona Department of Agriculture

The Arizona Department of Agriculture is the State's regulatory agency for agriculture, including animals, plants, and environmental services. Title 3 of the Arizona Revised Statutes contains the provisions related to agricultural topics such as dangerous plant pests and diseases, pesticides, brands and marks, and seizure of livestock. Their mission is to regulate and support Arizona agriculture in a manner that encourages farming, ranching, and agribusiness, while protecting consumers and natural resources.

The proposed revised plan includes desired conditions, objectives, and guidelines to continue treatment of nonnative invasive plant species: DC-Veg-1, Obj-6, and Guides-Plants 2 to 4.

Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT)

The Arizona Department of Transportation is responsible for planning, building, and operating a State highway system and maintaining bridges.

Improvement and Construction

Other than Central Yavapai Metropolitan Planning Organization (CYMPO) road projects referenced in community and regional plans above, road improvement and construction plans are not expected to impact the Prescott NF.

Long Range Planning

ADOT is in the midst of updating their long range plan, the "State Long-Range Transportation Plan." As of January 2011, the goals and objectives of this plan were final. The full plan is scheduled for completion by June 2011. Select goals and objectives that relate to the Prescott NF are as follows:

- **Improve Mobility and Accessibility** – Implement critical and cost-effective investments in infrastructure to expand access to transportation and optimize mobility and reliability in the transportation of passengers and freight.
- **Link Transportation and Land Use** – Protect the capacity of the State transportation system by developing policies and partnerships that strengthen the coordination of land use and transportation planning and implementation. Objectives focus on coordinating with public agency land use planning.
- **Support Economic Development** – Develop and operate a State transportation system that provides predictable freight and people movement throughout the State to support a competitive and thriving economy for Arizona.
- **Promote Natural, Cultural, and Environmental Resources** – Protect and restore the natural, cultural, and environmental resources of Arizona while improving and maintaining the transportation system. Objectives include: (1) implement transportation solutions that improve mobility, enhance communities, and protect and restore the environment; (2) implement an ecological connectivity approach to transportation planning and system development; and (3) collaborate with government agencies and other stakeholders to identify and consider natural habitats, the human environment, and protected natural or cultural resources when planning new or improved transportation services.
- **Strengthen Partnerships** – Develop and nurture partnerships that support coordination and integration of ADOT’s planning and investment in State transportation infrastructure with public and private organizations and agencies responsible for land use, conservation, environmental planning, and freight infrastructure.

The main impacts to Prescott NF management due to long-range transportation planning are: (1) the continued increase in visitors to the area to enjoy recreation opportunities and (2) the potential for new corridors to block pronghorn and other wildlife movement or migration habitat. Appendix B, Proposed and Probable Management Practices, of the proposed revised plan indicates the intent of the Prescott NF to coordinate with the Arizona Game and Fish Department to identify key wildlife linkages so that mitigations (e.g., overpasses or underpasses) can be placed at strategic locations to allow for wildlife movement. Improving recreation opportunities and avoiding resource damage is addressed in desired conditions, objectives, and guidelines: DC-Rec-1 and 2, DC-Wilderness-1, DC-Wild and Scenic-1, Obj-7 to Obj-17, Std-Rec-1 and 2, Guides-Rec-1 to 12, Std-Wild-1 to 3, Guide Wild-1 to 10, Std-W&S-1 to 2, and Guide-Interp-1.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD)

The Arizona Game and Fish Department’s “Wildlife 2012, Strategic Plan for the Years 2007-2012,” provides the management direction for the department’s program of work. The plan contains several goals and objectives that may have an impact on Prescott NF management. Table 4 displays selected goals and objectives from the strategic plan and how the proposed revised plan or its alternatives respond.

Table 4. Goals and objectives from AZGFD Strategic Plan 2007-2012 and how the Prescott NF proposed revised plan responds

Goals and Objectives Related to the Prescott NF as Expressed in AZGFD Strategic Plan 2007-2012	How the Prescott NF Proposed Revised Plan Responds
<p>Wildlife Resource Management:</p> <p>Conserve, preserve, enhance, and restore wildlife populations and their habitats.</p> <p>Conserve, preserve, enhance, and restore Arizona's wildlife habitat and resources while balancing resource needs with recreational uses.</p> <p>Maintain or improve the quality and connectivity of habitats to support a diversity of wildlife species.</p> <p>Minimize the negative impacts of invasive species on wildlife and their habitats.</p> <p>Improve the status of wildlife, with particular emphasis on those species listed as species of greatest conservation need.</p>	<p>Preparation for development of the proposed revised plan included development of the "Prescott NF Ecological Sustainability Report." This document considered ecosystems and species habitats that needed improvement. A list of wildlife species was developed, including consideration of the species of greatest conservation need (at the time, the Prescott NF identified this list as "Species of Concern and Species of Interest"). Threats to these species were identified and response to those threats are found in vegetation desired conditions and objectives, standards, and guidelines that were developed to address ecosystems or specific wildlife habitat needs: DC-Veg-1 to 22, DC-Aquatic-1-2, Obj-1 to 5, Obj-26-28, Std-WL-1, Guides-WL-1 to 7, and Guides-Fish/Aquatics-1 to 3.</p> <p>The Prescott NF expects to coordinate with AZGFD in development of wildlife linkages with the Prescott NF. Guide-Trans-3 states that roads and trails should be designed to not impede terrestrial and aquatic wildlife species movement and habitat connectivity.</p> <p>Guide-Lands-2 lists lands that contain important habitat such as that needed to maintain migration patterns or important linkages as a criterion for consideration of proposals for land acquisition.</p> <p>Desired conditions, objectives, and guidelines provide guidance for dealing with nonnative invasive species: DC-Veg-1, Obj-6, Std-Plants-1 and 2, and Guide-Fish/Aquatics-3.</p>
<p>Wildlife Recreation:</p> <p>Increase the opportunity for the public to enjoy Arizona's wildlife resources while maintaining and improving wildlife resources.</p> <p>Increase opportunities for use and enjoyment of wildlife.</p> <p>Increase participation in wildlife oriented recreational activities.</p> <p>Provide access to public and other lands that are blocked by private lands.</p>	<p>Standards and guidelines related to motorized travel on the Prescott NF indicate that the motor vehicle use map is the basis for OHV or other motorized vehicle routes: Std-Rec-1 and 2, Guide Rec-1.</p> <p>Guidelines indicate that educational information will be developed and shared: Guide-Rec-3, Guide-Interp-1.</p> <p>DC-Lands-1 states that rights-of-way for legal access are present commensurate with need. Guide-Lands-1 states that easements should help provide adequate access to the Prescott NF.</p> <p>Obj-7 calls for addition of developed recreation areas, especially near water. Obj-13 provides for maintaining recreational fishing opportunities in lakes/pond sites.</p>
<p>Off-highway Vehicle, Watercraft, and Shooting Sports Recreation Goals:</p> <p>Increase the opportunity for the public to enjoy shooting sports. Encourage participation in education and information programs supporting safe and responsible use of off-highway vehicles and watercraft, while maintaining or improving wildlife resources and habitats.</p> <p>Increase management of off-highway vehicles and efforts to minimize their impacts on wildlife</p>	<p>Obj-14 calls for identifying new methods for providing visitor information. Obj-10 calls for partnership with AZGFD in developing a designated target shooting area.</p> <p>While the motor vehicle use map is the controlling document for motorized travel, the proposed revised plan provides guidance for motorized game retrieval: Std-Rec-1, Guide-Rec-1.</p> <p>Accurate and adequate frequency of signage is emphasized in DC-Rec-2, Obj-12, and Guide-Rec-9.</p>

Goals and Objectives Related to the Prescott NF as Expressed in AZGFD Strategic Plan 2007-2012	How the Prescott NF Proposed Revised Plan Responds
<p>and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Continue to work with interested user groups and agencies to protect existing funding and acquire new funding sources dedicated to safe and responsible off-highway vehicle use.</p>	
<p>Partnerships:</p> <p>Maintain and develop effective partnerships that enable the AZGFD and its partners to reach mutual goals.</p> <p>Enhance the AZGFD's ability to manage wildlife resources.</p> <p>Reinforce responsible and safe OHV and watercraft recreation that minimizes impacts on wildlife resources and habitats.</p> <p>Provide recreational shooting opportunities through partnerships.</p>	<p>Obj-24 and Obj-13 call for partnering with AZGFD to better provide recreational fish opportunities and to protect and enhance habitat for native fish species.</p> <p>Obj-10 references partnership with AZGFD to develop a designated target shooting area. Obj-28 indicates that the Prescott NF would like to cooperate in improving water developments for wildlife.</p> <p>Appendix B, Proposed and Probable Management Practices, indicates a desire to continue cooperation with AZGFD and others to carry out management activities. In particular, development of wildlife linkages within the Prescott NF for pronghorn migration was referenced.</p>

The Arizona State Wildlife Action Plan titled, "Arizona's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy: 2005-2015," was approved in 2006 and provides the vision for managing Arizona's fish, wildlife, and wildlife habitats over the next 10 years. The plan contains several key elements which may provide information for or have an impact on Prescott NF management. Table 5 displays selected goals and objectives from the wildlife action plan and how the proposed revised plan or its alternatives respond.

Table 5. Selected goals and objectives from AZGFD Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy and how the Prescott NF proposed revised plan responds

Goals and Objectives Related to the Prescott NF as Expressed in Arizona's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy: 2005-2015	How the Prescott NF Proposed Revised Plan Responds
<p>Species of Greatest Conservation Need:</p> <p>The AZGFD prioritized a list of species for conservation actions aimed at improving conditions for those species through intervention at the population or habitat level. Over 300 species were identified as being vulnerable or the species with the greatest conservation needs.</p>	<p>Preparation for development of the proposed revised plan included development of the "Prescott NF Ecological Sustainability Report." This document considered ecosystems and species habitats that needed improvement. A list of wildlife species was developed, including consideration of the species of greatest conservation need (at the time, the Prescott NF referenced them as "Species of Concern and Species of Interest"). Threats to these species were identified and response to those threats included vegetation desired conditions, objectives, standards, and guidelines that were developed to address ecosystems or specific wildlife habitat needs: DC-Veg 1 to 22, DC-Aquatic-1 to 2, Obj-1 to 5, Obj-26-28, Std-WL-1, Guides-WL-1 to 7, and Guides-Fish/Aquatics-1 to 3.</p>
<p>Habitats of Greatest Conservation Need:</p> <p>The AZGFD divided the State into 17 vegetation types. All of these habitats were treated as habitat in need of conservation. A statewide habitat analysis that answers the question of</p>	<p>Potential natural vegetation types were defined for the Prescott NF. Those that are highly departed from historic conditions have high priority for treatment in order to trend toward conditions. Desired treatments are displayed in: Obj-1 to Obj-5.</p>

Goals and Objectives Related to the Prescott NF as Expressed in Arizona's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy: 2005-2015	How the Prescott NF Proposed Revised Plan Responds
where to focus in each habitat has not been completed.	
<p>Stressors/Threats to Arizona's Wildlife and Wildlife Habitats:</p> <p>The AZGFD identified 70 stressors that have serious impacts to habitat in Arizona and an additional 4 stressors that act on species alone. The stressors were categorized into: (1) a rapidly increasing human population, (2) changes to water storage and delivery systems in the Southwest, (3) alteration of communities by invasive nonnative species, and (4) the ongoing drought and warming trend.</p>	<p>Population increases are addressed in recreation response to increased number of visitors as well as open space concerns: DC-Rec-1 and 2, DC-Wild and Scenic-1, DC-Wilderness-1, DC-Transportation and Facilities-1, DC-Open Space-1, and DC-Lands-2.</p> <p>Changes to water storage are addressed in need for change calling for maintaining or improving watershed integrity: DC-Watershed-1 to 6.</p> <p>Invasive, nonnative species were addressed as part of vegetation changes: DC-Veg-1 and DC-Aquatic-1.</p> <p>Climate change was addressed in desired conditions for ecosystem resilience to climate change (DC-Ecosystem Resilience-1) and potential changes are included in background statements for potential natural vegetation type desired conditions.</p>
<p>Conservation Actions for Arizona's CWCS:</p> <p>Conserve Wildlife Habitat</p> <p>Promote the restoration and protection of aquifers, springs, streams, rivers, lakes, and riparian systems. Support regulations ensuring minimum instream flow and water rights for wildlife resources.</p> <p>Maintain and reestablish habitat and habitat connectivity.</p> <p>Promote habitat connectivity by removing or modifying barriers, protecting corridors and riparian areas, and using wildlife friendly roadway crossing structures.</p> <p>Promote maintenance and restoration of habitat connectivity.</p> <p>Develop standards for modification of existing structures and corridors to reduce impacts to wildlife.</p> <p>Wildlife Management</p> <p>Promote implementation of recovery plans, habitat conservation plans, and other cooperative agreements for sustaining wildlife resources.</p> <p>Manage so as to sustain or enhance sport fish and native fish populations.</p> <p>Maintain and construct new wildlife water developments. Encourage conversion of livestock waters so they are also continuously usable by wildlife.</p> <p>Collaborate with partners to evaluate sampling techniques, reduce duplication of effort, and develop pathogen decontamination protocols to</p>	<p>DC-WS-1: "Adequate quantity and timing of water flows are maintained in streams, groundwater dependent ecosystems, and wetlands to retain or enhance ecological functions." DC-WS-2: "Riparian corridors are intact and functioning across the landscape. Links between aquatic and upland components are maintained." DC-WS-6: "Wetlands, seeps, springs, wet meadows, and associated wetlands or riparian systems support stable herbaceous and woody vegetative communities." DC-Aquatic-1: "Riparian vegetative communities within aquatic systems are intact and functioning."</p> <p>Obj-25: "Modify or remove at least 3 to 5 miles of fence to prevent impacting pronghorn antelope movement" (alternative C calls for 10 to 15 miles of fence removal). Guide-Lands-2: includes lands that contain important wildlife habitat as a criterion for land acquisition. Guide-Range-2: "Consider the following for structural improvements: implement design features that incorporate wildlife needs and reduce barriers to movement and entrapment hazard; consider wildlife needs in fence placement and design to reduce barriers and hazards to movement and minimize entrapment; remove fencing when it is no longer needed." Guide-Lands-4: "Wildlife movement corridors, such as Arizona's wildlife linkages, should be considered when energy sources and transmission lines are located."</p> <p>DC-WL-1: "Locations of sensitive flora and fauna species are known and secure. Habitats that support these populations are enhanced to facilitate protection of sensitive flora and fauna species." Guide-WL-1: "Habitat management objectives and terrestrial species protection measures from approved recovery plans should be applied to activities occurring within federally listed species habitat." DC-Aquatic-1: "Streams, springs, and wetlands that have potential to support native fish and/or other aquatic species provide quality and quantity of aquatic habitat within the natural range of variability." Obj-24: "Restore native fish species to 2 to 3 stream reaches." Obj-13: "Work with</p>

Goals and Objectives Related to the Prescott NF as Expressed in Arizona's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy: 2005-2015	How the Prescott NF Proposed Revised Plan Responds
<p>limit impacts to wildlife.</p> <p>Reduce/eliminate the effects of feral animal populations in sensitive habitats or near wildlife populations of concern.</p> <p>Public education and law enforcement to benefit wildlife and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Support prevention and suppression of accidental or arson-caused wildfire through information and education and enforcement of appropriate regulations.</p> <p>Representing Wildlife Values in Multiple-use Planning</p> <p>Promote restoration of natural fire regimes for improving grassland and forest health.</p> <p>Promote adoption of sustainable forage management standards and guidelines for livestock and wildlife.</p> <p>Promote conservation of sensitive areas and habitats for wildlife.</p> <p>Encourage development and implementation guidelines for mining and landfill operations that consider the needs of wildlife resources.</p> <p>Encourage land management agencies to manage road and trail networks to ensure sustainable wildlife resources.</p> <p>Promote programs for eliminating or limiting the spread of invasive plants and animals, and the recovery or reintroduction of native populations.</p> <p>Limit the spread of invasive plants and promote the restoration of native vegetation in disturbed areas.</p>	<p>partners to maintain and enhance recreational fish opportunities.” Obj-28: “Improve 3 to 15 water developments for wildlife” (alternative C includes 5 to 15 water developments). Std-Range-1: “Water troughs shall incorporate escape devices to prevent animal entrapments.” Guide-Fish/Aquatics-3: “To prevent the spread of invasive species and fungal disease within aquatic habitats, clean equipment, watercraft, and gear of plant, animal, and mud material before use on the Prescott NF.”</p> <p>DC-Wildlife-1. “Terrestrial habitats are free of or minimally impacted by nonnative or feral species.”</p> <p>DC-Rec-1: “A wide variety of recreational experiences and benefits exist across the Prescott NF landscape to discover and enjoy. Visitors are aware of and comply with forest regulations.” Guide-Interp-1: “Use of opportunities to provide interpretation and education related to the natural work and Prescott NF resources including forest health activities such a fuels management, benefits of wildland fire management, short-term restrictions related to wildlife reproduction, ecological importance of riparian systems.”</p> <p>DC-Veg-6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, 21, and 22 include desired fire regimes that trend toward natural regimes for grasslands, ponderosa pine, piñon and juniper, and desert communities.</p> <p>Guides-Range-1 to 4 include mitigations for grazing activities.</p> <p>Obj-24, 26, and 27 deal with habitats for native fish species and pronghorn migration habitat.</p> <p>Guide-Locatable Minerals-1: “Minimize disturbance to riparian vegetation.” Guide-Minerals Materials-1: “Adverse effects of aquatic and other riparian dependent resources from mineral material operations should be avoided.” Guide-WL-5 includes mitigations for bats associated with caves or adits.</p> <p>Guide-Trans-3: “Roads and trails should be designed to not impede terrestrial and aquatic wildlife species movement and habitat connectivity.” Guide-Trans-5: “To avoid unintended entrapment, wildlife friendly design for cattle guards should be incorporated for new and replacement installations.”</p> <p>DC-Veg-1: “Native plant communities dominate the landscape, while invasive species are nonexistent or in low abundance. Establishment of invasive plant species new to the Prescott NF is prevented.” DC-Aquatic-1: “Aquatic habitats are free of or minimally impacted by nonnative plant and animal species.”</p>

Arizona State Land Department (AZSLD)

The practice of allocating public lands for various beneficiaries in Arizona dates back to the founding of the territory in 1863. The current system of managing these lands, referred to as State Trust lands, was established with the Arizona State Land Department in 1915. Since its inception, the AZSLD has been granted authority over all trust lands as well as the natural products they provide. This authority over trust land is central to the AZSLD's primary mission of maximizing revenues for its beneficiaries, a role that distinguishes it from other agencies charged with

management of public lands (e.g., national parks, national forests, state parks). As of 2008, the AZSLD managed over 9 million acres in land holdings for 14 beneficiaries, the most prominent of which is the K-12 public school system. Most of the State lands can be used for livestock grazing purposes only. Public use of the lands is regulated by permit.

The AZSLD may dispose of (i.e., exchange) or lease the lands for natural resource use or commercial development purposes. The AZSLD prepares a 5-year plan that represents potential areas of concern to initiate land sales and long-term leases. As of February 2011, this plan was not available.

Lands under management of the Arizona State Land Department are not public lands and, as such, require a permit to recreate on them. Therefore, the main interaction between the Prescott NF and the AZSLD may be to participate in land exchange or acquisition, or to gain easements or rights-of-way for legal access. Guide-Lands-1 addresses easements and Guide-Lands-2 and Guide-Lands-3 address criteria for land exchange or acquisition.

Arizona State Parks (ASP)

The mission of the Arizona State Parks is to manage and conserve Arizona's natural, cultural, and recreational resources for the benefit of the people, both in our parks and through our partners (Arizona State Parks, 2010). Arizona State Parks manage several parks across Arizona. Three of these parks are near the Prescott NF: Fort Verde State Park, Dead Horse State Park, and Jerome State Historic Park. Arizona State Parks have seen a continual increase in visitation over the years, with over 1,000,000 visitors in 1985 to over 2,000,000 visitors in 2010 (Arizona State Parks, 2010). The State and National financial crisis impacted the management of State parks. In Fiscal Year 2010, the ASP reduced the number of employees and closed 13 of its 28 parks (Arizona State Parks, 2010).

The 2008 "Arizona Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan" (SCORP) identifies the State's outdoor recreation priorities. Several action items have the potential to influence NFS lands:

- Look holistically across geographic boundaries, disciplines, governments, private interests, and generations and examine all benefits and costs, not just fiscal costs. (In reference to growth).
- Expand options such as private landowner incentive programs and recreational liability laws, which would allow public access across private and State and Federal leased lands.
- Provide for OHV use on public lands but manage it properly, to reduce conflicts with other recreation users and minimize the activity's impacts on natural and cultural resources, as is done for other recreational activities. Implement standards for constructing sustainable OHV routes; involve user groups in planning, building, and maintaining satisfactory routes and facilities; and enact and enforce consistent OHV laws and regulations.
- State and Federal agencies should implement coordinated interagency planning efforts for new recreational areas and trail systems to ensure an equitable regional distribution of desired recreational opportunities and access to natural environments.

The SCORP also identifies the major impacts and trends related to outdoor recreation in Arizona. Arizona offers a wide variety of outdoor recreation opportunities with 6 national forests, 21 national park sites, 8 national wildlife refuges, 8 Bureau of Land Management field offices, 21 American Indian tribes, 30 State parks, 23 State wildlife areas, and hundreds of county and city parks and recreation areas. These public lands provide opportunities for activities such as picnicking, developed and primitive camping, wilderness backpacking, hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding, cross-country skiing, wildlife watching, hunting, fishing, boating, water skiing, rock climbing, four-wheel driving, motorized trail biking, all-terrain vehicle riding, and snowmobiling, among others (Arizona State Parks, 2007).

The “Arizona Trails 2010: State Motorized and Non-motorized Recreation Trails” plan provides information and recommendations to guide Arizona State Parks and other agencies in their management of trails. The priority recommendations for motorized trails are: protect access to trails/acquire land for public access; maintain and renovate existing trails and routes; mitigate and restore damage to areas surrounding trails, routes, and areas; and establish and designate motorized trails, routes, and areas. The priority recommendations for nonmotorized trails are: maintain existing trails; keep trails in good condition; and protect access to trails/acquire land for public access (Arizona State Parks, 2009).

While the proposed revised plan includes direction for the Prescott NF, past history shows that the Prescott NF expects to coordinate among other jurisdictions in trail location and management and motorized transportation planning. In particular, Obj-29, which calls for acting on 10 opportunities to acquire lands, as available and feasible, for open space, riparian, and wildlife habitat values, could be partially fulfilled by coordinating with other agencies in expanding the Verde River Greenway. Current coordination activities between communities, agencies and jurisdictions are ongoing. The recreation strategy effort provides a forum for recreation providers and citizens to discuss types of recreation needed and to help determine how providers and interested individuals might best meet demands and provide desired benefits.

Arizona State Forestry Division

The mission of the Arizona State Forestry Division is to manage and reduce wildfire risk to Arizona’s people, communities, and wildland areas, and provide forest resource stewardship through strategic implementation of forest health policies and cooperative forestry assistance programs. The Arizona State Forestry Division provides for the prevention and suppression of wildland fire on 22 million acres of State Trust land and private property located outside incorporated communities.

The 2010 “Arizona Forest Resource Assessment,” gathering input from partner agencies and stakeholders, evaluated the forested landscapes of Arizona and based on present and future forest conditions, trends, and threats, identified priority landscapes and strategies for addressing forest resource issues and opportunities.

Table 6 displays selected goals and objectives from the “Arizona Forest Resource Assessment” and corresponding components of the proposed revised plan.

Table 6. Selected goals and objectives from Arizona Forest Resource Assessment and how the Prescott NF proposed revised plan responds

Collaborative Goals Expressed in Arizona Forest Resource Assessment, 2010	How the Prescott NF Proposed Revised Plan Responds
People and Forests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People and communities receive maximum benefits from forests and trees. • Minimum negative impacts to trees and forests. Occur. 	<p>The proposed plan identifies desired conditions for the sustainable use and enjoyment of ecosystems: DC-Veg-1 to 3; DC-Rec-1 and 2; and DC-Open Space-1.</p>
Ecosystem Health: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resilient and diverse forest ecosystem structures, processes, and functions. • Progress toward landscape scale outcomes, restoration of unhealthy ecosystems, and enhanced sustainability with negative impacts. 	<p>The plan identifies specific desired conditions and treatment objectives for all vegetation types that address ecosystem structure, processes, and functions under a changing climate: DC-Veg-6 to 23, Objectives-1 to 6.</p>
Water and Air: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved water quality and quantity from forested watersheds. • Improved health and resiliency of forested aquatic systems (riparian areas, springs, and wet meadows). • Increased public understanding of the importance of forests to Arizona's water quality. • Improved air quality. 	<p>The plan identifies specific desired conditions and treatment objectives to assist with the restoration and maintenance of watershed integrity including water quality, quantity, and timing of flows: DC-Watershed-1 to 6; Objectives-18 to 23.</p> <p>The plan identifies the conditions desired to assist with keeping smoke and dust emissions below National standards, protecting airshed visibility, and promoting public support for wildland fire management programs: DC-Airshed-1.</p>
Fire: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildland ecosystems with appropriate fire regimes maintain health and resiliency of natural vegetation. • "Fire Adapted Communities" that provide shared stakeholder responsibility for healthy landscapes and wildfire prepared communities. • Enhanced wildland fire management capacity in Arizona. • An Arizona public and government leadership that is well informed about wildland fire management, science, and prevention issues. 	<p>The plan identifies specific desired conditions and treatment objectives for all vegetation types and wildland-urban interface areas: DC-Veg-6 to 23, Objectives-1 to 6.</p> <p>Wildland fire standards and guidelines provide guidance for trending toward or achieving ecosystem desired conditions with an emphasis on the protection of life and property: Std-Wildland Fire-1 and 2; Guides-Wildland Fire-1 to 10.</p>
Economics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realized long-term economic potential of sustainable forest products and bioenergy. • Protection of areas with economic development potential related to ecosystem services. • Community recognition of the economic importance of protecting healthy natural systems. 	<p>The plan identifies desired conditions and guidelines for all vegetation types that include restoration and maintenance of healthy ecosystems while providing for the sustainable use of those ecosystems. Sustainable uses, including livestock grazing, firewood cutting, and timber harvest that contribute to the social, economic, and cultural structure and stability of communities: DC-Veg-1 to 3.</p>

Collaborative Goals Expressed in Arizona Forest Resource Assessment, 2010	How the Prescott NF Proposed Revised Plan Responds
<p>Climate Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased resilience of ecosystems to climate change. • Reduced rate of future climate change through maximized carbon sequestration. • Broad public and community understanding of climate change science. 	<p>The plan identifies a set of desired conditions to assist with building ecosystem resilience and adaptive capacity for plant and animal communities to accommodate trends of a changing climate: DC-Ecosystem Resilience-1.</p>

Federal Agencies

Federal agencies influencing or bordering on the Prescott NF include the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS); the Westwide Corridor programmatic decision; the Upper Agua Fria National Monument and the Bradshaw-Harquahala Resource Planning Area (both managed by the Bureau of Land Management); and the Coconino, Kaibab, and Tonto National Forests. In this section the FHWA, FWS, and the Westwide Corridor will be addressed separately; however, the areas managed by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service will be introduced separately, but interactions addressed together.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

The role of the Federal Highway Administration is to ensure that America's roads and highways are safe and technologically up-to-date. Although most highways are owned by State, local, and tribal governments, FHWA provides financial and technical support. The Federal Lands Highways funding provides dollars for roads and highways within federally owned lands, such as national forests.

The Central Federal Lands Highway division, of which Arizona is a part, is in the process of developing its long-range transportation plan. The planning effort has identified two major trends: (1) Arizona population is increasing primarily in urban areas and (2) forest visitation and recreation is increasing as a result of population increase. Within Arizona, 12 percent of the paved forest highway network is rated as poor or failed, while 7 percent of the unpaved network is rated as poor or failed, and 3 percent of the bridges are in poor condition.

Within or near the Prescott NF, the need for an Eastern Corridor Study for a possible controlled access facility was identified by the Central Yavapai Metropolitan Planning Organization (CYMPO). A CYMPO regional transportation plan (2006) showed the possible corridor stretching from Interstate-17 north of Highway 69, across Highway 169, crossing the edge of the Prescott NF until it reached Highway 89 north of Chino Valley.

There are citizen and national forest concerns about the possible crossing of the national wild and scenic eligible upper Verde River (see CYMPO Regional Transportation Study, 2006 in Table 1 above). Prescott NF proposed revised plan includes DC-Wild and Scenic-1 and Std-W&S-2 that apply to conditions on the upper Verde River. In addition, alternative D includes the Muldoon Potential Wilderness Area as recommended wilderness. There could be conflicts between the possible route and maintenance of wilderness character if that alternative were selected.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's main role is to administer the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Section 7 (1)(1) of the ESA directs Federal agencies to aid in conservation of listed species and section 7 (1)(2) requires that agencies, through consultation with the FWS, ensure that their activities are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or adversely modify designated critical habitat. As projects and activities are planned, forest managers consult with the FWS.

The FWS issues national policies to promote the conservation and recovery of listed species, including species recovery plans. The FWS is in the process of developing a strategic plan to react to climate change. The Prescott NF proposed revised plan includes Guide-WL-1 and Guide-Fish/Aquatics-1 that call for incorporation of requirements included in current recovery plans for federally listed threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate plant and wildlife species as management activities are carried out.

In 2005, a regionwide amendment to all forest plans and FWS biological opinions was completed. In May 2010, the Forest Service within the Southwestern Region (Arizona and New Mexico) re-initiated consultation on the regionwide amendment. A tiered consultation from the FWS consisting of a biological opinion and conference opinion was completed in March of 2012 related to forest plans originally completed in the 1980s. As the Prescott NF plan revision process moves toward preparation of a final environmental impact statement, a biological assessment will be prepared and a separate biological opinion from the FWS for the Prescott NF will be issued.

Department of Energy and Bureau of Land Management: Westwide Corridor

In November of 2008, a programmatic decision was reached to establish corridors for the preferred location of future oil, gas, and hydrogen pipelines and electricity transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands in the states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. This was required by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 in order to improve coordination among agencies and expedite applications to construct or modify such facilities. In Arizona, 650 miles of corridor were identified with 81 percent incorporating existing utility and transportation rights-of-way. Within the Prescott NF, multimodal corridor segment 61-207 crosses the Prescott NF from south to north from about 0.75 mile northeast of Dewey, to the northern forest boundary just west of County Road 173 (Vol. III Department of Energy EIS, 2008).

There are two areas where the Prescott NF proposed revised plan interacts with the Westwide Corridor programmatic decision. The first relates to location of power lines and pipelines. Desired Condition DC-Lands-1 states that power lines and pipelines are located and co-located with existing corridors when compatible. Guide-Lands-5 includes the following guidance: "New energy proposals should be located within existing corridors, including the Westwide Corridor, unless valid concerns about the reliability and integrity of the State's electrical grid indicate otherwise." The second interaction relates to the "Upper Verde River Eligibility Report Update for the National Wild and Scenic River System" (2011). The existing Arizona Public Service power line and the Westwide Corridor make up the boundary between two river segments: (a) segment 2 is classified as wild, including an essentially primitive area that is inaccessible except by trail and (b) segment 3 is classified as scenic, including areas where some structures may be

seen, the river is accessible by roads, and roads may occasionally bridge the river. By acting as a boundary between segments, more flexibility is provided for potential future applications for construction or modification.

Bureau of Land Management: Agua Fria National Monument and Bradshaw-Harquahala Resource Management Plan

On January 11, 2000, Presidential Proclamation 7263 created the Agua Fria National Monument to ensure protection of an extraordinary array of scientific and historic resources. The Agua Fria National Monument (AFNM) is located in southeastern Yavapai County, Arizona, and contains 70,900 acres of BLM-administered lands and 1,444 acres of private land. The decisions in the approved resource management plan (RMP) only apply to the BLM-administered lands within the AFNM. The Bradshaw-Harquahala Planning Area encompasses lands north and west of Phoenix and south and west of the Prescott NF in west-central Arizona. The area includes remote and undeveloped zones of desert and mountain ranges, as well as urban interface zones near Buckeye, Phoenix, Prescott, Wickenburg, and other communities. These lands sustain a wide range of activities and resources.

Coconino National Forest

The approximately 2 million-acre Coconino National Forest (Coconino NF) is located in north-central Arizona at the southern end of the Colorado Plateau. It is located east of the Prescott NF, and the Verde River and Sycamore Creek provide the boundary between the two national forests. The Coconino NF is also revising its land management plan and working drafts of this plan 2011-2012 were used as a comparison with the Prescott NF proposed revised plan. The needs for change in the Coconino NF revised plan focus on recreation, community and forest interaction, and maintenance and improvement of ecosystem health.

Kaibab National Forest

The Kaibab National Forest (Kaibab NF) is broken into three geographically separate ranger districts. They are found both north and south of Grand Canyon National Park and near Williams, AZ. The most southern district is the Williams Ranger District which shares a boundary with the Prescott NF north of Drake and Perkinsville. Vegetation types in the area primarily include piñon-juniper woodlands. Working drafts of the Kaibab NF proposed revised plan 2010-2012 were used to determine interactions between guidance found in the Prescott NF revised plan and the Kaibab NF revised forest plan.

Tonto National Forest

The Tonto National Forest (Tonto NF) covers approximately 3 million acres of land. It stretches from Mesa to Strawberry and from Cave Creek to Globe. The Cave Creek Ranger District shares a border with the Prescott NF. The Cave Creek Ranger District includes a portion of Pine Mountain Wilderness, a portion of Mazatzal Wilderness, portions of the Wild and Scenic Verde River, and Horseshoe and Bartlett Recreation Areas. The balance of the district is under general multiple-use management. This area is approximately half Sonoran desert and half chaparral vegetation type. The 1986 "Tonto National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan" and its more recent amendments were used to determine interactions between management on the Tonto NF and the Prescott NF proposed revised plan.

Comparison of Federal Resource Management Plans

After review of plans, questions were developed related to need for coordination between land management agencies. Each question is answered in table 7 and interactions of the various plans are identified. No conflicts were identified that may require additional alternatives.

Table 7. Comparison of Federal resource management plans

Questions to Determine Landscape Interactions	Interactions Between the Prescott NF Proposed Revised Plan and Neighboring Land Management Agencies
How is direction coordinated for the designated wild and scenic segments of the Verde River?	The Coconino, Prescott, and Tonto NFs coordinated on preparation of the Verde Wild and Scenic River Management Plan. Each of these national forests referenced this coordinated plan in standards and guidelines within their current or proposed land management plans.
What other rivers are considered eligible for national wild and scenic designation and how do they interact?	<p>The upper Verde River is eligible for national wild and scenic river designation, and classifications were developed by the Prescott NF in coordination with the Coconino NF which borders a portion of the upper Verde River on the east. Guidance for river management resides in the Prescott NF plan. The Coconino NF determined a wild classification for Sycamore Creek that flows into the upper Verde River.</p> <p>Three segments of the Agua Fria River, determined by the BLM as suitable for designation to the national Wild and Scenic Rivers System, are to be maintained in free-flowing conditions and managed to protect their outstandingly remarkable scenic, fish, wildlife, and cultural resource values. While the Agua Fria River does not flow through the Prescott NF, upstream tributaries like Ash Creek and Lynx Creek ultimately flow into the Agua Fria. Eight stream segments have been determined by the BLM to be eligible for consideration as to their suitability as additions to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Ash Creek (1.1 miles) and Little Ash Creek (2.7 miles) are among those.</p>
Is wilderness character affected by guidance found in Federal agency plans?	<p>The Prescott NF proposed revised plan includes eight recommended wilderness areas. Sycamore Canyon A and C recommended wilderness areas are adjacent to the designated Sycamore Canyon Wilderness that overlaps the Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott NFs. Sycamore Canyon C overlaps both the Kaibab and Prescott NFs. Desired conditions for recommended wilderness do not conflict between the two forests. The Kaibab NF includes a group size restriction of 12 people and a pack animal maximum of 15 animals per group in standards and guidelines for both designated and recommended wilderness; the Prescott NF includes restrictions of 15 people and a pack animal maximum of 10 animals per group in standards and guidelines.</p> <p>The Prescott NF recommended wilderness area called Castle Creek Contiguous (east of Castle Creek Wilderness) is adjacent to BLM lands. These BLM lands are allocated to retain wilderness characteristics in the BLM Black Canyon Management Unit of the Bradshaw-Harquahala Resource Management Planning Area. The Castle Creek Contiguous area along with Castle Creek Wilderness and BLM wilderness character lands increase the value of wilderness characteristics of areas across both jurisdictions.</p> <p>The Agua Fria National Monument identifies an area allocated to retaining wilderness characteristics along and east of the Agua Fria River in the southern portion of the monument. Three corridors identified as passage recreation management area zones provide access to the area. Passage recreation management area zones are areas where visitor use is not directed but is accommodated and focuses on designated motorized travel. The Prescott NF is not expected to have any impact on this area.</p>

Questions to Determine Landscape Interactions	Interactions Between the Prescott NF Proposed Revised Plan and Neighboring Land Management Agencies
Are opportunities for recreational trails and recreational settings affected by other plans?	<p>Recreation opportunity settings are similar between the southern portion of the Crown King Management Area, within the Prescott NF, and that shown in map 14 for the Bradshaw-Harquahala Planning Area.</p> <p>Both the Kaibab and Prescott NFs classify lands along their shared boundary as semiprimitive nonmotorized or semiprimitive motorized in the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS). That is, dirt roads are relatively far apart with area between roads that is accessible by foot; there is a low likelihood of seeing other people.</p> <p>The boundary area between the Prescott and the Tonto NFs is primarily made up of designated wilderness; the area on both forests not designated as wilderness provides settings classified as semiprimitive nonmotorized and semiprimitive motorized.</p> <p>The Verde River provides most of the boundary between the Coconino and Prescott NFs. By having a natural boundary, visitors can more easily differentiate between management styles. Settings within the Verde Valley vary from urban environments within towns and cities to semiprimitive nonmotorized settings near Black Canyon where the likelihood of interacting with other people is rare. Motorized use on all the national forests is allowed on designated trails, roads, and areas as indicated by each forest's motor vehicle use map.</p>
How well is scenery management coordinated across Federal land management agencies?	Within the Verde Valley, both the Coconino and Prescott NFs desired condition descriptions call for maintaining the scenic backdrop that provides value to Verde Valley communities.
How well is motorized big game retrieval coordinated across AZGFD game management units?	The Prescott NF proposed revised plan uses language consistent with the Williams Ranger District Travel Management Decision to guide the use of motorized game retrieval forestwide. The Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott NFs all share part of AZGFD Game Unit 8. The Coconino NF deferred to the Kaibab NF guidelines for motorized game retrieval within AZGFD Game Unit 8.
Is management of nonnative invasive plant species coordinated across Federal land management agencies?	<p>The Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott NFs identify the desire for domination of the landscape with native plant communities while invasive species are nonexistent or in low abundance. These forests also reference appendix B of the "Final Environmental Impact Statement for Integrated Treatment of Noxious or Invasive Weeds" (2005) related to direction for treatment of nonnative invasive plant species.</p> <p>The current Tonto NF plan includes few references to nonnative invasive species. The Agua Fria National Monument and Harquehala Resource Management Plans include desired conditions describing maintenance of diverse viable populations of native plants while the impact of invasive species on native ecosystems is reduced from current levels. They also include management actions such as emphasizing use of native species for restoring or rehabilitating disturbed areas and carrying out control efforts in cooperation and collaboration with weed management associations or other organizations.</p>
Are vegetation desired conditions and management direction coordinated across boundaries?	<p>Grassland vegetation guidance of the Agua Fria National Monument is similar to that found in the Semi-Desert Grasslands Potential Natural Vegetation Type (PNVT) for the southeastern portion of the Prescott NF. In other parts of BLM managed lands, upland vegetation is managed to consist of a mix of native perennial grass and ground cover adequate to improve wildlife habitat and a long term stable population of columnar cacti and paniculate agave where ecological potential exists.</p> <p>The Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott NFs used the Forest Service Southwestern Region process for identification of PNVTs and participated in identifying coordinated desired conditions for each PNVT found on the national forests. The Tonto NF, Cave Creek Ranger District, manages vegetation with a primary emphasis</p>

Questions to Determine Landscape Interactions	Interactions Between the Prescott NF Proposed Revised Plan and Neighboring Land Management Agencies
	on wildlife habitat improvement, livestock forage production, and dispersed recreation.
How well are areas identified for managed wildland fire coordinated among Federal land management agencies?	<p>In the two BLM resource management plans, areas identified as appropriate for managed wildland fire are found in the eastern part of the Upper Agua Fria National Monument adjacent to similarly appropriate areas on the Prescott NF. Areas appropriate for managed wildland fire south of Crown King include a 1 to 2-mile-wide corridor next to the boundary between the Prescott NF and Castle Hot Springs Management Unit.</p> <p>The Kaibab NF working draft plan indicates that the whole forest may sustain managed wildland fire. The Prescott NF indicates that managed wildlife fire can be appropriate in the area next to the Kaibab NF boundary and on a case-by-case basis in the Prescott NF portion of the Verde Valley next to the Coconino NF.</p> <p>The Coconino NF desired conditions indicate that wildfires can be managed across most of the landscape for resource benefits. The Prescott NF, Tonto NF, and BLM Resource Management Plans call for protecting the Sonoran desert from fire.</p>
How well are habitat improvements to provide migration habitat for pronghorn coordinated?	<p>Pronghorn movement corridors are generally mapped for the Agua Fria National Monument. They are located adjacent to the Prescott NF within areas identified as Semi-Desert Grassland. Prescott NF Obj-27 calls for treatment within pronghorn migration habitat that is found near the monument. Obj-1 calls for burning within desert grasslands to trend toward historic disturbance intervals and to improve grassland value for wildlife. Coconino NF desired conditions call for free movement of wildlife across the forest and across forest boundaries to access adjoining habitat. Kaibab NF desired conditions call for habitat interconnectedness to allow for movement of wide ranging species, and habitat configuration allows for movement of wildlife populations to promote genetic flow.</p>

Tribes

Six tribal groups within Arizona have connections with the Prescott NF: the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Tonto-Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation

Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation lands occupy a rectangular shaped piece of land measuring 4 miles east to west and 10 miles north to south. Located in northeastern Maricopa County, the reservation is bisected by the southerly flowing Verde River. Economic enterprises operated by the nation include: Fort McDowell Casino, Fort McDowell Tribal Farm, Fort McDowell Yavapai Materials, Fort McDowell Adventures, Radisson Resort and Conference Center at Fort McDowell, and the We-Ke-Pa Golf Club (NAU, 2011).

Hopi Tribe

The Hopi Tribe's main land base is located in the northeastern section of Arizona with a total area of approximately 1.6 million acres. The area consists of low lying deserts, gullies, buttes, and mesas, rising as high as 7,200 feet. Most of the reservation is open land and is used for community, religious, farming, business, and livestock purposes. The scarcity of water is a

limiting factor in future economic or agricultural development. The Hopi manage a 200-acre industrial park site in Winslow (NAU, 2011).

Hualapai Tribe

The Hualapai Reservation encompasses about 1 million acres along 108 miles of the Grand Canyon. The Hualapai Department of Natural Resources operates a wildlife, fisheries, and parks program; prepared a Watershed Management Plan (2006); prepared a Fire Management Plan (2002); and has a Forest Management Plan (1990 to 2000) that is now being revised. The overall goal of the Hualapai Department of Natural Resources is to produce long term, sustainable, balanced, multiple use of natural resources under the direction of the Hualapai Tribal Council.

The fire management plan includes goals to: (1) protect human safety and property while managing timber and range resources sustainably; (2) maintain adequate air and water quality; and (3) reduce the likelihood of catastrophic fire. The 2006 Watershed Management Plan includes identification of nonpoint source pollution sources and associated mitigation actions to improve water quality in the Colorado River and within the Truxton Wash and the Upper Gila watersheds. The tribe is actively managing endangered native fish by operation of an endangered fish rearing facility. Elk have been transported to the area and a big game hunting program is active. (Hualapai Department of Natural Resources, 2011).

Grand Canyon West on the Hualapai Reservation is at the west rim of the Grand Canyon. The enterprise offers tour packages that include views from the “Skywalk” (i.e., a glass viewing area that enables visitors to walk beyond the rim of the Grand Canyon), helicopter and boat tours, and other excursions on the reservation.

Tonto-Apache Tribe

The Tonto-Apache Tribe is located in northwestern Gila County approximately 95 miles northeast of Phoenix. Consisting of 85 acres, the reservation is south of and adjacent to the community of Payson. The amount of tribal land ownership will increase upon acquiring an additional 240 acres of land from the Forest Service. The tribe’s economic enterprises include Mazatzal Casino, Paysonglo Lodge, Marble Slab Creamery, and the Tonto-Apache Tribal Market and Smoke Shop (NAU, 2011).

Yavapai-Apache Nation

The Yavapai-Apache Reservation is located in the Verde River valley in central Yavapai County. The 636-acre reservation is made up of five separate parcels of land. Topographic features of the Middle Verde Reservation include intermittent streams, terraces adjacent to the river, and rich flood plain soil deposits. The nation operates the Cliff Castle Casino, the Lodge at Cliff Castle, and the Conference Center at Cliff Castle near Montezuma Castle National Monument. Yavapai-Apache Nation Native Visions offers scenic van tours, horseback riding, and a gift shop. Other businesses include Yavapai-Apache Construction, a sand and rock business, and farming/ranching (NAU, 2011).

Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe

The Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe is located adjacent to the city of Prescott in central Yavapai County. The reservation is topographically diverse, ranging from the relatively flat Granite Creek area to mountainous terrain north of the residential area and west of U.S. Highway 89. Today the tribal economy is tied to the economy of the Prescott community which focuses on tourism and retail sales and services. The tribe owns and operates the Sundog Industrial Park, Frontier Village Shopping Center, Bucky's Casino, and the Prescott Resort and Conference Center (NAU, 2011).

Interaction Between the Prescott National Forest Proposed Revised Plan and Tribes

With the exception of the Hualapai Department of Natural Resources plans, natural resource plans for those groups who have a connection with the Prescott NF were not available. However, Prescott NF plan guidance could interact with economic and social needs of some of the tribes. The groups most affected could be those located near the Prescott NF or those most economically and culturally tied to the area. Portions of plan guidance that interact with these groups include the following:

- Desired conditions and objectives for recreation, transportation, and facilities provide a description of future recreation opportunities. This information, such as descriptions of desired trail conditions, will affect the quality of recreation that visitors experience and indirectly may increase the number of visitors to business ventures provided by the tribes or nations.
- Desired conditions and objectives developed to help trend toward desired conditions related to open space and scenic values could provide the same type of benefit to tribal groups.
- Desired conditions for heritage (DC-Heritage-1 and 2) express the Prescott NF's intent to preserve and protect historic and prehistoric sites including American Indian sacred places and traditional cultural properties, places, and areas. In addition, they state that use of forest products by affiliated American Indian nations, tribes, and communities is expected to be available for traditional practices.
- One of the outstandingly remarkable values of the portion of the upper Verde River that is eligible for national wild and scenic designation is its cultural resource values. This river will be retained in free-flowing condition and its outstandingly remarkable values, including cultural resource values, will be protected.

References

- Arizona Department of Agriculture. (2010). Annual Report FY2009-2010. Phoenix, AZ.
- Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. (2011). About Us. Phoenix, AZ.
<http://www.azdeq.gov/function/about/index.html>
- Arizona Department of Transportation. (2010). 2010 Statewide Planning Framework. 9.0 Final Role Out of the Statewide Framework. Phoenix, AZ.
<http://www.bqaz.gov/StatewideTransportationPlanningFramework.asp>

- Arizona Department of Transportation. (2010). Arizona State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fiscal Years 2010-2013. Phoenix, AZ.
http://www.azdot.gov/MPD/Priority_Programming/index.asp
- Arizona Department of Water Resources. (2011). Mission and Goals. Phoenix, Arizona.
<http://www.azwater.gov/AzDWR/PublicInformationOfficer/MissionAndGoals.htm>
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. (2006). Arizona's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy: 2005-2015. Phoenix, AZ.
http://www.azgfd.gov/pdfs/w_c/cwcs/downloads/CWCS_Final_May2006.pdf
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. (2007). Wildlife 2012 Strategic Plan. Phoenix, Arizona.
http://www.azgfd.gov/inside_azgfd/documents/Wildlife2012forWeb.pdf
- Arizona State Forestry Division. (2010). Statewide Forest Resource Assessment and Strategy. Phoenix, AZ.
<http://www.azsf.az.gov/userfiles/file/Arizona%20Forest%20Resource%20Assessment-2010.pdf>
- Arizona State Land Department. (2011). Real Estate Division. Phoenix, AZ.
<http://www.land.state.az.us/programs/realestate/futureDisp.htm>
- Arizona State Land Department. (2011). State Land Department Historical Overview. Phoenix, AZ. <http://www.land.state.az.us/history.htm>
- Arizona State Parks. (2007). Arizona 2008 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). Phoenix, AZ.
- Arizona State Parks. (2009). Arizona Trails 2010: A Statewide Motorized and Non-Motorized Recreational Trails Plan. Phoenix, AZ.
- Arizona State Parks. (2010). Arizona State Parks FY09/10 Annual Report July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010. Phoenix, AZ.
- Ash Fork Development Association and the Community of Ash Fork. (2004). Ash Fork Action Plan II. Ash Fork, AZ. August 2004.
- Bureau of Land Management. (2010). Agua Fria National Monument Resource Management Plan. Phoenix, AZ. <http://www.blm.gov/az/st/en/prog/planning/afria-bradshaw-final.html>
- Bureau of Land Management. (2010). Bradshaw-Harquahala Resource Management Plan. Phoenix, AZ. <http://www.blm.gov/az/st/en/prog/planning/afria-bradshaw-final.html>
- City of Cottonwood. (2003). Cottonwood General Plan 2003 – 2013. Cottonwood, AZ.
<http://www.ci.cottonwood.az.us/genplan.php>
- City of Prescott Valley and citizen volunteers. (2002). Prescott Valley General Plan 2020. Prescott Valley, AZ. <http://www.pvaz.net/index.aspx?page=137>
- City of Prescott. (2003). Prescott General Plan. Prescott, AZ.
http://www.cityofprescott.net/d/general_plan_051804.pdf
- Coconino County Community Development Department. (2003). Coconino County Comprehensive Plan. Flagstaff, AZ. <http://www.coconino.az.gov/comdev.aspx?id=142>

- Community Sciences Corporation In Association with Dava & Associates; Lima & Associates. (2006). The Verde Valley Regional Land Use Plan. Yavapai County, AZ.
<http://www.co.yavapai.az.us/Content.aspx?id=34544>
- Department of Energy and Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. (2008). Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, Designation of Energy Corridors on Federal Land in the 11 Western States. Final Volume I: Summary and Main Text and Final Volume III: Map Atlas Map E8. Washington, DC.
- Federal Highway Administration. (2011). Who We Are. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/whoweare/whoweare.htm>
- Fish and Wildlife Service. (2011). Consultations – Overview. Department of the Interior. <http://www.fws.gov/endangered/what-we-do/consultations-overview.html>
- Forest Service. (1985). Tonto National Forest Plan. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southwestern Region.
http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/tonto/landmanagement/?cid=fsbdev3_018762
- Forest Service. (2010). Kaibab National Forest Proposed Land Management Plan. Williams, AZ: Kaibab National Forest.
http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5154723.pdf
- Forest Service. (2011). Coconino National Forest Draft Land Management Plan. Flagstaff, AZ: Coconino National Forest. <http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/coconino/plan-revision.shtml>
- Forest Service. (2011). Upper Verde River Eligibility Report Update for the National Wild and Scenic River System. Prescott, AZ: Prescott National Forest.
<http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/prescott/planrevision/docs-conc-proc/conc-proc-wsr.pdf>
- Hualapai Department of Natural Resources. (2002). 2002 Fire Management Plan. Peach Springs, AZ: Hualapai Tribe.
- Hualapai Department of Natural Resources. (2006). 2006 Watershed Management Plan. Peach Springs, AZ: Hualapai Tribe.
- Hualapai Department of Natural Resources. (2011). Organization and Mission. Peach Springs, AZ: Hualapai Tribe.
- Interagency Fire and Emergency Management Group of the Prescott Area Wildland/Urban Interface Commission. (2004). Yavapai Communities Wildfire Protection Plan. Prescott, AZ. <http://www.pawuic.org/>
- Lima and Associates. (2007). Central Yavapai Metropolitan Planning Organization Regional Transportation Study. Prescott, AZ.
http://cympo.com/pdf/2030/01242011_FINAL_REPORT_SAFETEA-LU_AMENDMENT_2007.pdf
- Northern Arizona University, Center for American Indian Economic Development. (2011). Flagstaff, AZ. <http://www.cba.nau.edu/caied/tribepages/Tribes.asp>
- Paulden Area Community Association and the Residents of the Paulden Area. (2007). Paulden Community Plan. Paulden, AZ.

- Prescott Area Wildland-urban Interface Commission. (2004). Prescott Basin Community Protection and Economic Development Plan. Prescott, AZ.
- Town Council of Chino Valley. (2003). Town of Chino Valley General Plan. Chino Valley, AZ.
http://www.chinoaz.net/dev_services/generalplan.shtml
- Town of Camp Verde. (2004). Camp Verde General Plan. Camp Verde, AZ.
<http://www.campverde.az.gov/government/town-clerk/documents/>
- Town of Clarkdale. (2002). General Plan Program 2002. Clarkdale, AZ.
<http://www.clarkdale.az.us/2002GeneralPlan/generalplan.pdf>
- Town of Dewey-Humboldt. (2009). Town of Dewey-Humboldt 2009 General Plan. Dewey-Humboldt, AZ.
- Town of Dewey-Humboldt. (2010). Town of Dewey-Humboldt Open Space and Trails Plan. Dewey Humboldt, AZ.
- Yavapai County. (2003). Yavapai County General Plan. Prescott, AZ.
- Yavapai County. (2012). Yavapai County's 2012 Comprehensive Draft Plan.

